

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-17 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 12-17 have been amended. No new matter is added. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration.

Applicant hereby perfects foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 by submitting the English translation of the foreign priority document and the Verification of Translation.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended the claims to address the rejection, as the Examiner suggested.

On the Merits

Response to Examiner's Arguments

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's Response did not address the issues raised in Applicant's response. Specifically, Applicant noted that claim 1 requires all of the features to be comprised within a server, i.e. "a server comprising." Applicant noted that even according to the Examiner's rejection and interpretation of the reference, all of the features allegedly disclosed in *Silberberg* were not disclosed in "a server," as required by claim 1.

For example, Applicant noted on page 10 of the response that a “communication process unit” is, according to the Examiner disclosed in a parking meter, as discussed in paragraph [0022] of *Silberberg*.

Regarding the “payment process unit” of claim 1, the Examiner contended it was disclosed in a “central facility,” as indicated by paragraphs [0033] - [0041].

As is apparent, a “parking meter” and a “central facility” do not appear to be located within a “server” as required by claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the rejection was/is inappropriate.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 and 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Silberberg* (WO 200163563 A1).

Independent claim 1 now requires:

A server, comprising:

a communications process unit performing a communicating process with a user device and a system of billing a user through a network for an amount, the amount based on a predetermined total length of time;

a retrieving process unit retrieving the system corresponding to an identification information received from the user device from a storage unit;

an obtaining process unit obtaining charge information requested by the user from the system retrieved by the retrieving process unit;

a transmitting process unit transmitting the charge information to the user device; and

a payment process unit performing a payment by the retrieved system according to a request for payment from the user device.

The server according to claim 1, searches the system of billing on the basis of the identification information included in the request for payment. This is different from the configuration of *Silberberg*, in which it is connected to a station (50) first, and then a user inputs the information of a parking bay.

Also, in the server according to claim 1, the obtained charge information is transmitted to the user device, and a payment is performed according to a request for payment from the user.

By contrast, *Silberberg* discloses transmitting the obtained information to the user device (paragraph 52 of *Silberberg*). Thus, *Silberberg* does not disclose performing a payment according to a request for payment from the user device upon transmitting information to the use device.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 2:

Claim 2 has been amended to require:

A server, comprising:

a communications process unit performing a communicating process with a user device and a system of billing a user through a network for an amount, the amount based on a predetermined total length of time;

a retrieving process unit retrieving the system, corresponding to an identification information received from the user device or according to a request;

an obtaining process unit obtaining current use information from the system retrieved by the retrieving process unit;

a receiving process unit receiving notification request information relating to a timing of notifying the current use information; and

an information providing unit transmitting the obtained use information to the user device according to the notification request information received from the user device.

The amendment above to claim 2 is similar to that of claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented above regarding claim 1, also apply to claim 2. The amendment to claim 2 also has the added feature of “transmitting the use information according to the notification request information received from the user device.” Support for this amendment may be found in Step S42 of FIG. 4 and its corresponding description in the specification.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is presently in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 8, 9 and 12-17:

As independent claims 8, 9 and 12 - 17 contain similar features to those discussed above regarding claims 1 and 2, the same arguments also apply to the similar independent claims.

Dependent Claim 10:

As claim 10 depends on claim 8, the same arguments as discussed above with respect to claim 8 also apply to claim 10.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Silberberg* and further in view of *Admasu* (US Application 2002/0032601).

Claims 6 and 7:

As claim 6 contains similar features to that discussed above regarding claims 1 and 2, the arguments presented above regarding claims 1 and 2 also apply to claim 6. Additionally, as claim 7 depends from claim 6, the same arguments also apply to claim 7.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Dennis M. Hubbs

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 59,145

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/DMH/klf

Attachments: Verification of Translation
English Translation of Priority Document.